## Case 3:14-cr-00161-EMC Document 9 Filed 11/06/13 Page 1 of 1 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

DANT	KAIVEISCO DIVISION
United States of America,	) Case No. CR 3-17-107235C
Plaintiff, v. Without Athyrus Wilson Defendant.	STIPULATED ORDER EXCLUSING THE UNDER THE SPEEDY TRIAL ACTION (CARRELL OF THE SPEEDY TRIAL ACTION (CARR
Speedy Trial Act from \( \text{N} \) \( \text{\figs.} \), 2013 to by the continuance outweigh the best interest of the state of the continuance outweight the best interest of the continuance outweight the continuance outwei	on Nov o, 2013, the Court excludes time under the Dec U, 2013 and finds that the ends of justice served the public and the defendant in a speedy trial. See 18 U.S.C. § bases this continuance on the following factor(s):
Failure to grant a continuance wou See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(i).	ald be likely to result in a miscarriage of justice.
defendants, the nature of the or law, that it is unreasonable to ex	lex, due to [check applicable reasons] the number of e prosecution, or the existence of novel questions of fact appearation for pretrial proceedings or the trial shed by this section. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(ii).
	ald deny the defendant reasonable time to obtain counsel, due diligence. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv).
	ald unreasonably deny the defendant continuity of counsel, given nmitments, taking into account the exercise of due diligence.
	Id unreasonably deny the defendant the reasonable time, taking into account the exercise of due diligence.  And to continue time for a hearing from the form the first time.
IT IS SO ORDERED.	Cause
DATED: 11-6-13	JACQUELINE SCOTT CORLEY United States Magistrate Judge
STIPULATED: Attorney for Defendant	$\sim$ $\sim$ $\sim$ $\sim$